

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	] 1	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/019,710		05/06/2002	Evgueni Kniazev	KNIAZEV-I (PCT)	1084	
25889	7590	02/12/2004		EXAMINER		
WILLIAM			WILKINS III, HARRY D			
COLLARD & ROE, P.C. 1077 NORTHERN BOULEVARD				ART UNIT	ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
ROSLYN,		-		1742		
				DATE MAILED: 02/12/200	4	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/019,710	KNIAZEV, EVGUENI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Harry D Wilkins, III	1742				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C.§ 133).				
Status						
<ul> <li>1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on</li> <li>2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.</li> <li>3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.</li> </ul>						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	epted or b) objected to by the ld drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action of form PTO-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119  12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau.  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 12272001.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 1742

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Specification

1. A substitute specification in proper idiomatic English and in compliance with 37 CFR 1.52(a) and (b) is required. The substitute specification filed must be accompanied by a statement that it contains no new matter.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraki et al (US 6,337,060) in view of Suzuki et al (JP 56-152582).

Hiraki et al teach (see abstract and Example 2) a method of coating including treating diamond particles in a sulfuric acid solution, washing with purified (distilled) water and then plating using a nickel plating solution (i.e.-ultradispersed diamond particle solution) to form a composite coating including dispersed diamond particles.

However, Hiraki et al do not teach treating the diamond particles with a cationically active substance prior to the coating but after the washing with purified water.

Suzuki et al teach (see abstracts) treating diamond powder for dispersion in electroplating of nickel by contacting the diamond with a cationic surface active agent. This process improves adhesion of the diamond particles to the deposited metal layer.

Application/Control Number: 10/019,710

Art Unit: 1742

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have further treated the washed diamond particles of Hiraki et al with a cationic surface active agent as taught by Suzuki et al because the cationic surface active agent improves the adhesion of the diamond particles to the deposited metal layer.

Regarding claim 3, Hiraki et al teach (see Example 2) using nickel as the electrolyte suspension.

4. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraki et al (US 6,337,060) in view of Suzuki et al (JP 56-152582) as applied to claims 1 and 3 above, and further in view of "Cationic Surfactant".

The teachings of Hiraki et al and Suzuki et al are described above.

However, Suzuki et al does not teach that the cationic surface active agent is a tertiary or quaternary ammonium base.

"Cationic Surfactant" discloses (see page 1) the general state of the art of cationic surfactants (i.e.-surface active agents), particularly that quaternary ammonium compounds are the dominant commercial example and that they exhibit biocidal properties.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have used a quaternary ammonium compound as taught by "Cationic Surfactant" as the cationic surface active agent of Suzuki et al because the quaternary ammonium compounds are conventional cationic surfactants that also exhibit biocidal properties that would aid in making sure that the diamond particles are clean.

Art Unit: 1742

### Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Harry D Wilkins, III whose telephone number is 571-272-1251. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 10:00am-8:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy V King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Harry D Wilkins, III Examiner Art Unit 1742

hdw

ROY KING SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700